

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 27 to 54 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for immediate allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter included in claims 29, 30, and 33 to 38. In this regard, the Examiner will note that each of claims 29 (from which claims 35 to 38 depend), 30, and 33 (from which claim 34 depends) has been rewritten herein in independent form. Thus, it is believed and respectfully submitted that claims 29, 30, and 33 to 38 are in condition for immediate allowance.

III. Election/Restriction

Claims 45 and 52 have been amended herein without prejudice to depend from claim 29 (claim 54 already depended from claim 29 and claim 46 depends from claim 45), which has been indicated to include allowable subject matter and, as mentioned above, has been rewritten herein in independent form. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no lack of unity of invention and that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance.

IV. Objection to Drawings

The Drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for failing to show reference numerals mentioned in the specification. Accordingly, accompanying this Amendment is a Replacement Sheet for Figures 1 and 2, which show second gear input shaft 3 and flexible drive mechanism 30. No new matter has been added. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 47 and 48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to, for example, page 7, lines 26 to 32 of the specification, which recites, “[t]he overall construction of the superimposed steering system makes it possible for current to be supplied and/or signals to be forwarded between the components of the steering system without additional current guiding devices such as sliders or flat spiral springs, etc.” Thus, it is plainly apparent that the written description requirement is satisfied with respect to claims 47 and 48.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 27 to 44, 47 to 51, And 53 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 27 to 44, 47 to 51, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite.

Claim 27 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that the “servomotor supports a torque” and to add the word “other” after the word “vehicle” in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 27 to 44, 47 to 51, and 53 are sufficiently definite for at least the above reasons.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 27, 28, 39 to 42, 51 and 53 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 27, 28, 39 to 42, 51 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,768 (“Kiyosawa”). It is respectfully submitted that Kiyosawa does not anticipate these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 27 relates to a superimposed steering system for a vehicle. Claim 27 has been amended to recite that the gear unit output shaft rotates relative to the first gear unit input shaft. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 4, lines 7 to 15 of the specification.

Nowhere, does Kiyosawa disclose, or even suggest, this feature. Kiyosawa relates to a power assist device 5 having a hollow type electric motor 6 and a hollow-type wave drive gear 7 concentrically arranged around a steering shaft

2. According to Kiyosawa, the rotational output of the electric motor 6 is input to a wave generator 74 of the wave gear drive 7 which causes external teeth of the flexible external gear 73 to be brought into engagement with the internal teeth of a rigid internal gear 72, causing movement of the teeth in a circumference direction and transferring rotational output to the steering shaft 2. Nowhere, does Kiyosawa disclose a gear unit output shaft that rotates relative to the first gear unit input shaft.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Kiyosawa does not anticipate claim 27, or claims 28, 39 to 42, 51 and 53 which depend from claim 27. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 31, 32, 49, and 50 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 31, 32, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kiyosawa. It is respectfully submitted that Kiyosawa does not render these claims unpatentable for at least the following reasons.

Claims 31, 32, 49, and 50 ultimately depend from claim 27. As set forth above, Kiyosawa does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 27. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kiyosawa does not render unpatentable claims 31, 32, 49, and 50, which depend from claim 27.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 43 and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Kiyosawa and U.S. Patent No. 4,223,254 (“Adams”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kiyosawa and Adams does not render these claims unpatentable for at least the following reasons.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from claim 27 and therefore incorporate all of the features of claim 27. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 27, Kiyosawa does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 27. Adams does not cure the critical deficiencies set forth above. As such, the combination of Kiyosawa and Adams does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 43 and 44 which depend from claims 27, and therefore does not render unpatentable these claims.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

X. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2010

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646